IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
Appeal No.773 of 2003
In
Chamber Summons No.647 of 2003
In
Summary Suit No.1089 of 1999

Rohit M. Sanghvi & ors. ... Appellants

V/s.

Pankaj C. Gandhi & ors. ... Respondents

Mr.Yashodhan V. Divekar i/by M/s.Divekar & Co. for appellant.

Respondent No.2 in person.

CORAM : H.L. GOKHALE &
R.S. MOHITE, JJ.

DATED : 3rd May 2006

P.C. :

1. Heard Mr.Divekar in support of this praecipe which has been filed on behalf of the appellant. Respondent No.2 is present.

2. Mr.Divekar says that a clarification is required with respect to our observation at the end of para-2 of our order dated 26.8.2003 concerning appellant No.3. Appellant No.3 is an Advocate and in that matter we have observed that " ..... the role of the appellant no.3 in the matter is not merely professional". Mr.Divekar wants us to clarify as to what it meant thereby.

In our view, the sentence is clear and it conveys what it ought to convey. We do not think it is necessary to clarify the sentence any more. Praecipe stands disposed of.

(H.L. GOKHALE, J.)

(R.S. MOHITE, J.)